



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/471,287	12/23/1999	MAKOTO MIYAGI	0557-4877-2	7229
22850	7590 12/15/2005		EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			BRINICH, STEPHEN M	
	IA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. PATENT IN REEXAMINATION

09/471.287

EXAMINER

ART UNIT PAPER

20051207

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/471,287	MIYAGI, MAKOTO		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Stephen M. Brinich	2624		

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Stephen M. Brinich	2624					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 11/15/05 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. 							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejection in the second section in the second	on. ILED WITHIN				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re		the issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 	•	•	J				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: <u>3,7.9,8.9,9.9,10.9,12,15,19,21-24 and 2</u> Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,4-6,8,13,14,16-18,20,25 and 26</u> .	?7-34 .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a).				
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after ei	ntry is below or attach	ied.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Attachment. 			nce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)					

Application/Control Number: 09/471,287 Page 2

Art Unit: 2624

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

 Applicant's arguments filed 11/15/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues (11/15/05 Response: page 2, line 15 - page 5, line 2) that Applicant's description of the Prior Art (particularly Figures 8A-8C) fails to teach or suggest the claimed cutting off of opposite corners from square cells to form non-regular hexagonal cells and combining these non-regular hexagonal cells into a single halftone cell. Specifically, Applicant argues (11/15/05 Response: page 3, lines 14-27) that the Prior Art non-regular hexagonal cells produced by cutting off opposite corners from square cells (Figure 8B) are not combined into a single halftone cell (Figure 8C).

However, it is not clear what feature of Applicant's described Prior Art (Figure 8C) precludes a reading of the set of non-regular hexagonal cells as a combined single halftone cell, as per the singular "HEXAGONAL CELL" label of Figure 8C.

Conclusion

2. Any inquiry concerning the contents of this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Brinich at 571-272-7430.

Application/Control Number: 09/471,287

Art Unit: 2624

Page 3

Any inquiry relating to the status of this application or proceeding or any inquiry of a general nature concerning application processing should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 Customer Service center at 571-272-2600 or to the USPTO Contact Center at 800-786-9199 or 703-308-4357.

The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 7:00-4:30, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to contact the examiner and the Customer Service Center are unsuccessful, supervisor David Moore can be contacted at 571-272-7437.

Faxes pertaining to this application should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 official fax number, which is 571-273-8300 (as of July 15, 2005).

Hand-carried correspondence may be delivered to the Customer Service Window, located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Stephen M Brinich Examiner Art Unit 2624

smb Smf December 7, 2005

THOMAS D. LEE